

June 18, 2004
9:00 A.M.

CALL TO ORDER

MINUTES

CONSENT ITEMS

Page 1 of 7

recently the Walnut Hills Alumni Foundation has come forward and presented a plan. This caught the Community Council and City Staff by surprise as up to now the Alumni Foundation had never attended any of the community meetings. They (the alumni) are now indicating how they want to re-design the area for the eventual purpose of expansion of Walnut Hills High School. Again Planning Staff brought forth the re-design along with Mr. King, the developer. Mr. King said this re-design would not work for what had been planned with the Community Council's agreement. There would be plenty of land within the bounds of necessity for the possible Walnut Hills School expansion and no need for the Alumni Foundation to claim a need for the land the City would be using for the proposed Housing Development. What Walnut Hills wants to do is not affected by the proposed residential development consideration because they would not be using any of the school's property.

Mr. Tarbell asked if anyone from the Alumni or the School Board was in attendance today. Mr. Scheer indicated that he had been on the Walnut Hills Building Committee, but was attending this Commission meeting for another reason. Mr. Tarbell felt if more space were needed than what is currently available to them now, it would be imperative to hear from the school representatives. Mr. Tarbell told Larry that he was troubled by the absence of the Board of Education. Mr. Tarbell questioned if options were available to the school if our plan goes through. Again Mr. Harris pointed out that the Community Council does not agree with the Walnut Hills High School group on the re-routing and extension of Pleasant View. They asked to have someone from the Transportation Dept. included in the Community Council meetings to speak regarding bus route changes, i.e. Jonathon to Salsa. Regardless of other requests, the School's plan as presented does not meet the current requirements of the State for a new high school. Also pointed out was the fact that the school has neither the money nor a building fund at this time.

The Alumni Committee does accept the need for new homes in the area. This would bring in new people, possibly some transferring from older homes in the area to these newer homes and thus leaving open to new families coming in or even for teachers coming into the neighborhood to live. Most of Alumni input came up at the last minute. There will be 3.1 acres in this purchase. Mr. Tarbell repeated that he is troubled that School Board members are not at this meeting stating that our School Boards are critical. Mr. Harris reiterated that the Board was aware of the Community Council/Planning meetings and they never had representatives appear.

Mr. Faux noted that the next street over, Burnside, probably has heavy traffic. Both Pleasant View and Burnside accommodate parking for students. He questioned why they thought extending Pleasant View would not be a good idea? A loop could be set up in another area for student parking without making Pleasant View a cut through. Mr. Faux felt that the community is playing the part of the Transportation staff. Another major consideration would be getting emergency vehicles in and out. Yet another consideration would be the lack of appropriate width of Pleasant View. Mr. Faux felt if the School Board is not here it appears they are not interested. Ms. Muyaya stated that other groups mentioned have shown no interest in the Evanston Community Council meetings in the past.

Ms. Hankner wanted to hear from Sharon Muyaya, President of the Evanston Community Council and now present at this Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Muyaya said they have never left out any groups who might be affected by this change. She said the Council would like to have them as a partner in this development. For the record she said they usually are not present. Mr. Faux agreed that to have other groups at the meetings would be a good idea but it is not necessary.

Again Ms. Hankner requested approval on Items #1, 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10. Mr. Faux hesitated and said that he wants to remove item #9. It's a shame other community members were slow to get involved. Mr. Tarbell asked for the date of the next Planning Commission, which turned out to be July 23, 2004. Mr. Faux then rescinded his objection. A vote on Items #1, 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10 then followed.

Motion: Mr. Faux moved approval.

Second: Ms. McCray
Vote: All ayes (4-0), motion carries.

Mr. Scheer wanted to know if a copy of this agenda could be sent to the other parties, which had been mentioned. Ms. Muyaya said a new school is being built for Hoffman. In our community 99% of the students walk to the schools now. Our community has a very high regard for their good school system. Mr. Tarbell found that commendable, and as it should be. He said we would try to get a copy of today's action to Walnut Hills High School. Mr. Harris said they have revisited this issue a number of times and nothing new has been presented by any of the groups mentioned.

ITEM #5 -- Proposed Single-Family Residence at 3004 Paxton Knoll Lane, Mt. Lookout

A PD #21 was approved in 1990 for the area. Five buildings, shown on the map presented by Mr. Briggs, have been built. A new, second phase, includes two lots to the north. The proposal is for a 3,000 sq. ft. home sitting on a hillside, which would be graded out. A storm water retention pond and drainage inclines will handle water control in the chance of heavy rains. The Planning Staff recommends this additional development. There would be only eight total homes within this area. Five homes have been built; two homes had been rehabbed; now this new one will be built.

Mr. Clark, the developer, has only one house planned right now, a single family. However, easements, retention pond and sewers would allow for the building of another new home and he wants to reserve the right to build that other home in the future, as the CHIP program would allow. Both lots are just under a half-acre. He brought in a letter from his neighbor who is agreeable to the development.

Motion: Ms. Faux moved approval.
Second: Ms. McCray
Vote: All ayes (4-0), motion carries.

ITEM #6 -- Proposed Development at SW Corner of E. McMillan & Highland in Mt. Auburn

Mr. Briggs, Staff Planner, presented a Staff Report for E. McMillan Street and Highland Avenue in Mt. Auburn. The development would be a 10-story mixed-use building. Ms. McCray wanted to know what was involved in the property now. Jeff Jacobs and Pete Kaufman are the contractors and were present. JFP owned this site for several years, felt the need for new development had finally presented itself. They are planning an investment of \$25 million in multi-family dwellings for the neighborhood and the university area. They will be using an architectural firm from Atlanta. But a feasibility study had shown they should tone down their possible two or three buildings of four stories to a smaller scale and perhaps put in a neighborhood coffee shop. The proposal consists of about 115 units with about 150 to 375 parking spots. Jacobs met with the Community Council, which was happy to see the scaling down of the project. They have since met with MSD and the Water Works on issues pertaining to each of those groups. They would like to begin construction later in the fall.

Ms. Hankner requested a vote from the Planning Commission or any motions. Mr. Faux said he had a question on the parking access/egress, and if it would be off Highland? Mr. Briggs responded that at the time the T-zone was reviewed, Highland was the preferred location. It would be especially convenient to access the lower level from Highland. Mr. Tarbell wanted verification on the number of units. The response was 125 would be the total units. Rentals would range from \$1,100 for a 2-bedroom up to \$2,000 for a 4-bedroom.

Motion: Mr. Tarbell moved approval.
Second: Mr. Faux

Vote: All ayes (4-0), motion carries.

ITEM #7 -- 4112 Clifton Avenue Return Zone to Original R-4 Multi-Family

Ms. Wuerstle wanted to clarify an issue on this item. The customary charge is \$300 paid to the City for a zone change request. She had asked Felix Bere (Staff Planner) to look at this request and provide the Planning Commission with basic information. The recommendation was set up as a re-zone study and should have only provided basic information like whether the zoning of the property was, indeed, changed during the re-write process. A recommendation should not have been made at this time. Mr. Bere pointed to a color-key map. The gray colored area is the area we are talking about. Prior to new zoning they would have been entitled to put in a multi-family. The present zoning is one residence per parcel. Mr. Faux questioned if the property owner had requested a re-zone study. If it is a question of a re-zoning Mr. Faux wants to approve the request to study the rezoning free of charge.

Motion: Mr. Faux moved approval.

Second: Ms. McCray

Vote: All ayes (4-0), motion carries.

ITEM #8 – 3CDC, Redevelopment Plan for Washington Park Area

The presentation began with Ms. Kathy Schwab. Recently 3CDC asked her to help with their strategy. Ms. Schwab's group was asked to look at placement for the School for Creative and Performing Arts (SCPA) and also Washington Park School in relation to housing and the necessity for at least 430 parking spaces, especially for SCPA students. Another consideration was the placement of these schools in relation to Washington Park itself. The original plan also suggested parking spaces to include Music Hall with its Symphony schedule and approximately 100 incidental events. Ms. Schwab's group was given a 30-day deadline. An urban planner out of Boston was brought in and they worked with a school consultant who had previously worked with the Cincinnati Public Schools on their needs. A very small stakeholders meeting was held.

The following preliminary solution was reached within the 30-day deadline. As she spoke she pointed to the map of initial plan for the area, and then pointed to the new plan. The plan included a change in position of the Washington Park School To Walnut and 15th Streets, which is closer to residential housing and away from Central Parkway (a benefit for the younger school children). The SCPA would relocate to the site south of Washington Park originally slated for the new Washington Park School. It would face Central Parkway but also be along Washington Park (the Park, with this plan, would be extended).

Parking would be next to Music Hall and also include parking under Washington Park, which would improve access for public activity/events. Another two-level garage site has been investigated, but at the moment there is no funding available. About 14 school sites have been examined; some in the area north of Findlay Market, but CPS the plan required an elementary school north and south of Liberty Street. There is a deadline for the site; there were no sites we could get together for the budget and time allotted. We came up against a lot of negative issues on others sites. 3CDC is responsible for other areas. There will be some revenues from other area parking, etc. The area now chosen includes green space convenient to students and will get backing from corporations. This seems to give us the most for our money.

The group wanted to show this to the Planning Commission so they would have some background when firm proposals appear. At a time when something firmer is brought together it will be shown to Over-the-Rhine residents. The group felt that reaction from the neighborhood community might show up as very pro or very con and that would be a waste of time at this particular point. City Council was presented with a copy. A presentation is now in process and will continue for OTR stakeholders, parents, etc. This is a conceptual plan and has not yet been adopted. This plan would give the Community, etc. the best impact money for

development. They have made this presentation to many other groups, but would like this Commission to be on board on what might come up. Mr. Faux had a question which his son had brought up which was: what does the yellow shaded stripes represent? The response was just an effort to try to make a representation of “an arts corridor”. In shifting the locations of the schools, the whole impact is much more feasible. With the new perspective we are talking about an extension of the park and the public school.

Ms. McCray felt the small parcel across the street from the Music Hall would serve the purpose for the 750 parking spaces. Steve Leeper, President and CEO of 3CDC spoke to this issue. A number of hypotheses caused us to place the parking for Music Hall and the SCPA at the location presented on the rendering. We were presented with a goal not to have ingress or egress on Elm Street; the Parkway would be much better. We did look at the WGUC garage and to put on another level. To add another level would not only be cost prohibitive, but it is a distance issue from Music Hall and the area planned for outside events. We are also planning a multi-event garage building. Ms. McCray was curious if a parking lot would be the best use of the land. The building as presented in the rendering would allow for a 25 ft. level first floor (let’s say a restaurant) keeping the awareness of a garage above to a minimum. If the 100 or so events at Music would not keep a commercial restaurant alive, this first floor area could be presented as a “catered” restaurant/meeting room. Ms. McCray felt a parking facility would be the best use of the smaller parcel, but could understand their presentation.

Mr. Tarbell asked if the Pipefitters Union building would stay and would the façade of new buildings flow from that architecture. The response from Mr. Leeper was yes. Some people have been talking about putting offices inside. The Original CCM building has been re-done as white box office building. Mr. Leeper also suggested that opening up some windows on Music Hall would be a good façade flow. Mr. Faux feels the plan is very good and hopes it goes ahead as planned. Ms. Hankner thanked both Ms. Schwab and Mr. Leeper for their presentation.

Katherine Keough-Jurs (Staff Planner) reviewed the 2002 Over-the-Rhine Plan and explained the differences between the two. She felt the new plan as presented is in the same spirit of the 2002 Plan and can be seen as an implementation of the 2002 Plan. The major recommendations in 3CDC’s Plan do not vary greatly from those in the 2002 Plan. The 2002 Plan also recommends extension of the park north to 14th Street. The major difference is the school site location. The 2002 Plan recommended SCPA adjacent to Music Hall and Washington Park School south of Washington Park. During the 2002 planning process, very few sites were offered for school relocation. The Quality of Life committee was told that SCPA would definitely move to the Central Parkway site adjacent to Music Hall and was only offered two sites for Washington Park School – The central Parkway site south of Washington Park and a site north of Findlay Market. The committee recommended against the site north of Findlay Market because it would interfere with the Plan’s economic development recommendations and would not be supported by neighborhood housing patterns.

However, both changes to the school sites warrant further study. Moving SCPA to the site south of Washington Park requires a closer look at parking for the school. Since it is a magnet school it will have students bussed in, causing a review of loading and unloading areas. Because it is K-12, there will be a need for sufficient parking for both teachers and students. SCPA will need to be of appropriate scale for Central Parkway in order to help connect OTR to downtown in a more cohesive manner. There is not enough know about the specific new site of Washington Park School (at Walnut and 15th) to be able to make specific comments. Additionally, in 3CDC’s plan it is unclear whether or not the pool stays in Washington Park. CRC is concerned about this and will want to be involved in this decision. There is a need for additional review of the housing development recommended on Pleasant Street as it shows alleys vacated for parking. The 2002 OTR Plan recommended preservation of alleys as an important part of the pedestrian network. 3CDC should work to include community stakeholders and OTR council in discussions of this implementation plan.

Ms. Hankner again thanked all presenters.

Mr. Ken Cunningham, a 20-year member of the OTR community presented his point of view. The conversations have changed in this big, diverse community from constructive to divisive. Over the years there have been many plans presented to the community, yet to this point nothing has been built. Now, what seems to be a secret plan has been shown as something just about ready to be built. No one in OTR seems to have been informed of this plan. The litmus test on this plan would be to make sure the community recognizes itself in this plan. Mr. Cunningham said it would have been better to present this plan first to OTR community rather than to City Council. The OTR community is strong enough to be contentious if they do not agree with plans that appear to reject their needs as presented by them.

Ms. Hankner commended Mr. Cunningham on his presentation. She asked him to use his positive force in dealing with the OTR Community members to let them know that many people have come together to bring about the best possible use of the area, while keeping in mind the community's requirements. Mr. Faux noted that the community had presented certain pieces in certain places in the past. This rendering includes all the pieces they wanted with perhaps a few in different places.

Mr. Leeper remarked that as an outsider, he felt that many groups/people were doing their own planning. This plan as presented is a unified plan which brought together the input from many groups from the City, the Arts, the potential funding corporations as well as community planners for the schools and also 3CDC.

Ms. Hankner suggest that if Mr. Cunningham would present this plan as standing on the shoulders of the plans from the past 10 years the community would perceive it that way. Mr. Tarbell said that quite often to bring about a good plan of action, solid quiet work is often needed. Ms. Hankner suggested the new plans be presented to the community with the planners in attendance as often as they could. She also asked Margaret Wuerstle, Chief Planner, to have Katherine Keough-Jurs attend some of these meetings as she instituted the "comprehensive plan" on which part of the new plan stands.

Reminder on Item #7 to a member of the attendees -- the lot on Clifton Avenue would have a zoning study done without the \$300 fee.

ITEM #11 Lease with the Cincinnati Country Club for a portion of Bedford Avenue (paper street) west of Edwards Road.

A lease between the Cincinnati Country Club and the City of Cincinnati would keep control in the hands of the City. The lease can be broken; the abutting neighbors do not want the land used for athletic purposes, landscaping or lighting to be intrusive on the 9,000 sq. ft. Mr. Tarbell questioned if this one piece would be a non-contributing piece. Mr. Briggs said the Country Club wants to totally rework part of one of the existing holes, which will abut several existing homes. The club's activity at all times would face away from the houses and toward the Country Club.

Motion:	Mr. Faux moved approval.
Second:	Ms. McCray
Vote:	All ayes (4-0), motion carries.

ITEM #12 -- IDC Expansion

This study on the two properties at Paddock and Reading, and the opposite corner, was presented by Larry Harris (Staff Planner). An additional property is under foreclosure. Zoning could be inappropriate for the site. The Fire Station nearby and the Armory beyond would be included in the study area part expanding the business district. The Fire Station will be relocated at the old Sugar and Spice location. The present Fire Station is small even though the new equipment ordered would fit, the station is moving to another location where the response time would be better for the greater part of the community. The Community is also

considering a Sickie Cell Clinic in this study area. A request came in for the neighborhood to include the funeral home property in the existing IDC to protect that site while the study is being completed. Mr. Faux had questioned including all four-intersection properties as well as the Fire Station and the Armory. Mr. Harris felt the Community Council would agree to that and it would expedite the process as a whole. This would be an addendum to Item #12. The funeral home property, the Armory property, the fire station property and the Sickie Cell property were to be included as part of the IDC being studied.

Motion: Ms. McCray moved approval.
Second: Mr. Faux
Vote: All ayes (4-0), motion carries.

ITEM #13 -- Reimbursement to Green Township by the City of Cincinnati for rehabilitation of a short portion of Sumter Avenue and Casa Loma Blvd.

The City has agreed to a \$20,000 reimbursement.

Motion: Ms. McCray moved approval.
Second: Mr. Faux
Vote: All ayes (4-0), motion carries.

ITEM #14 -- Marvin Kraus' Letter and Attachments, dated June 4, 2004

Marvin's letter as usual is insightful noted Ms. Hankner. We will accept his letter and look into the areas that he has mentioned.

Motion: Mr. Faux moved approval.
Second: Ms. McCray
Vote: All ayes (4-0), motion carries.

Thank you all for your attention to the proceedings.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to consider, the meeting was adjourned.

Margaret A. Wuerstle, AICP
Chief Planner
Department of Community
Development & Planning

Date: _____

Terry Hankner, Chair Pro Tem
City Planning Commission

Date: _____